Remarks

Claims 1-12 are cancelled.

Claim 13-22 are pending.

Claims 13-22 are rejected.

Claim 13 is amended to comport with the suggestions made by the Examiner in the Clam objections made in the office action.

No new matter is added in view of these amendments.

ARGUMENTS

I. 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection of Claims 18-22

The Examiner rejected cancelled Claims 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed toward non-statutory matter. Specifically, the Examiner stated that Claim 18 is directed toward a computer based device, but the claim language [of the claim] does not specify that the device includes any hardware. The Examiner however provided a helpful suggestion as to overcome this rejection. Although the Examiner's appreciate the Examiner's assistance (and always encourage such comments to aid in the furtherance of prosecution matters), the Applicants do not believe that such an amendment is required at this time.

Referring to the text of Claim 18, a first storing means, a second storing means, and a third storing means are connected to a first processing means. A second processing means is also connected to the claimed first storing means, second storing means, and third storing means. Applicants assert that such storing means and processing means are in fact pieces of hardware. That is, structure would be necessary in order for a storing means to be connected to a processing means.

Applicants assert Claim 18 is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101 by the fact that an apparatus with specific hardware elements is claimed. Applicants also assert that Claim 19-22 also claim statutory subject matter in that they depend on Claim 18. Applicants request that the Examiner remove this rejection to these claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 13-22

The Examiner rejected Claims 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Block et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0182777A1, hereafter referred to as 'Block'). Applicants disagree with this grounds rejection.

As a recitation of the operation of the prior art, Block concerns itself with the problem of how to transform data into a XML compliant format, particular XBRL (see paragraph 0012 of Block). In principle, the invention will take raw data and annotate such data with XML tags that will label various elements of such data. That is, the invention will automatically convert conventional documents or data into outputs tagged with identifying data "tags" in a file (see paragraph 0008 of Block).

The solution proposed in Block to label data is to (a) identify data in a file, (b) select labels that correspond to metadata in the identified data, and (c) add the select labels/tags to label either metadata and/or elements in the identified data associated with the metadata (see paragraph 0032 of Block).

A practical example of what is disclosed in Block is given in paragraph 0047 where a company publisher who publishes financial statements will associate the company name with a tag <Company Name> label. This tag can be selected by using a list that contains labels from multiple taxonomies which can comport to different languages or standards. The invention then will allow that once this tag is identified, as similar tag may be associated to the labeled data by use of a synonym dictionary. That is, if the <Company Name> label were can be associated with another type of label through the use the dictionary to

represent something such as <Business> or <Corporation>. Hence, the data labeled as <Company Name> could also be associated with another tag as <Corporation>.

The disclosures of Block however have nothing to do with having "links" as recited in the present invention. That is, the present invention (for example claim 13) addresses the use of "metadata links" which is a link which points to selected essence data. This means that the link of the present invention operates akin to a Uniform Resource Locator which points to a metadata essence, although other types of metadata links exist. The invention of Block does not make use of metadata links that point to a metadata essence. Rather, the Block is concerned about labeling data (see paragraphs 0046 and 0047 of Block), where the "link" of Block is a label that will identify some attribute about the data. This label can then identified or changed by using a transformation program (see paragraphs 0049 and 0050 of Block).

As a further example of the operation of cited reference as not using metadata links, Block can identify a particular paragraph in a business report and determine that such a business report includes metadata referring to a particular paragraph. Block will extract this metadata and inputs it into a list. As referred to above, "metadata" in the present application represents two classes of metadata which are metadata essence and metadata link information. The application of Block implies that the cited to "metadata" is a metadata essence, not a link, because only the essence part of the metadata in Block can be inputted into the list. Block therefore aims to translate metadata between different taxonomies. The list will therefore associate essence metadata with a label, and provide the label as an output.

In other words, Block replaces or modifies the metadata essence of existing metadata by adding or replacing the label information to the metadata essence. The metadata link information, if one were to consider the principles of Block, would remain the same because the new metadata essence refers to the same particular paragraph. Thus, the metadata link information, if to be

considered in view of Block, is of no interest to the principles described in block. That is, the new labels of Block are not metadata links, but rather operate as additional essence metadata.

The present invention is different than what is disclosed in Block in that the metadata link information (that is: the reference pointing to a metadata essence) is used for determining the additional second metadata, and the claimed list is a list of links, instead of appending a label to data (as disclosed in Block).

The claimed elements of Claim 16 are also not shown where "the determined metadata has at least one second metadata link pointing to at least one third metadata, and wherein the third metadata is used for forming said first metadata". That is, two pieces of separate metadata are used to form the first metadata in the manner as claimed, is not found or suggested in Block. This claimed feature of Claim 21 is similarly not found or disclosed in Block.

For the reasons given above, Applicants assert that Claims 13-22 are patentable in view of the cited art of record.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Applicants request a three-month extension under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) to file this response. Please charge Deposit Account 07-0832 for this fee and for any other fees owed in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Joel M. Fogelson

Reg. No. 43,613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: 7/25/08

Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613